



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

objects, sometimes, unfortunately, sought to be obtained by unworthy means, and in the prosecution of their common object the action of any one member is binding upon all." For a somewhat similar decision under the English Trade Union Acts see *The Taff Vale Railway Co. v. The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants*, L. R. [1901], A. C. 426. For dictum contra see *Diamond Block Coal Co. v. United Mine Workers of America*, *supra*. As to the general right to injunction to restrain a third party from inducing a breach of employment see *Hitchman Coal & Coke Co. v. Mitchell*, 38 Sup. Ct. 65, commented on in 16 MICH. L. REV. 250, article in 27 YALE L. J. 779; *Eagle Glass & Mfg. Co. v. Rowe*, 38 Sup. Ct. 80; *McMichael v. Atlanta Envelope Co.*, 151 Ga. 776.

TRADE NAMES—DESCRIPTIVE WORDS.—Plaintiff, as owner of a business conducted under the name Active Transfer Co. and Active Parcel Delivery, sued to enjoin defendants from using the names Action Transfer Co. and Action Parcel Delivery. *Held*, an injunction was properly granted. *Jaynes v. Weickman* (Cal., 1921), 203 Pac. 828.

After holding the similarity of "action" with "active" to be such as would deceive the public, the court declared the adjective "active" not to be descriptive when used in relation to a transfer and parcel delivery company. It was "sufficiently fanciful" to entitle plaintiff "to protect the use as a trade name of the phrase of which it is a part." This distinction is illustrated by the two cases, *Scriven v. North*, 124 Fed. 894, and *Globe-Wernicke Co. v. Brown*, 121 Fed. 185, holding respectively that "elastic" was descriptive as applied to drawers, but fanciful as applied to book-cases. The narrow line of distinction is shown by comparison of the principal case with the following decisions that the adjectives concerned were descriptive and the phrase was not pre-emptible: "Instantaneous Tapioca," *Bennett v. McKinley*, 65 Fed. 505; "Imperial Beer," *Beadleston v. Cooke Brewing Co.*, 74 Fed. 229; "Continental Insurance," *Continental Ins. Co. v. Continental Fire Assn.*, 96 Fed. 846; "Ever-ready Coffee Mills," *United States v. Bronson Co.*, 17 App. D. C. 471; "Gold Medal Saleratus," *Taylor v. Gillies*, 59 N. Y. 331; "Snowflake Bread," *Larrabee v. Lewis*, 67 Ga. 561; "Health Preserving Corsets," *Ball v. Siegel*, 116 Ill. 137; "Favorite Letter File," *Cooke & Cobb Co. v. Miller*, 65 N. Y. S. 730; "Lather Kreem Shaving Compound," *Krank Mfg. Co. v. Pabst*, 277 Fed. 15. If the court in the principal case had been bothered by these precedents it might have rendered the same decree while saying: "We are of the opinion that the complainants have failed to establish a valid technical trade mark; but inasmuch as the testimony shows unfair competition, which entitles them to an injunction, it is deemed unnecessary to discuss the distinctions which seem to differentiate this case \* \* \*." *Scriven v. North*, 134 Fed. 366, 380.

TRIALS—IGNORANCE AND INCOMPETENCE OF ATTORNEY AS GROUND FOR NEW TRIAL.—Defendant was charged with taking indecent liberties with a twelve-year-old girl. At the trial the defendant's attorney sought to show that all